

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated May 9, 2008, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire August 9, 2008. A Petition for a one-month extension of time extending the period of response to September 9, 2008 is filed herewith.

Claims 19-21 And 23 Are Patentable Over Husted

Claim 19 recites in part, "**aborting the signal reception sequence** if a new signal is detected, wherein the new signal is stronger than the detected in-band signal by at least a threshold amount". The Second Office Action cites paragraphs 0031 and 0054 as teaching these limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses these characterizations.

Paragraph 0031 teaches that weak signal detection and strong signal detection (used to identify an in-band signal) are independent and complementary features. Weak signal detection is used for arriving signals not large enough relative to blockers or noise to cause gain changes, whereas strong signal detection is used for larger arriving signals.

In paragraph 0054, Husted teaches that windowing, e.g. using a value that is half the previous value added to half the subsequent value at the symbol boundary, can reduce a temporary step in the in-band power at the symbol boundary due to an interferer. In paragraph 0054, Husted also teaches that the lowest 28 of the 32 samples can be used, thereby nulling out any temporary spike, and the thresholds are adjusted accordingly to compensate for the reduced power measurement due to the missing four samples.

Applicant respectfully submits that weak/strong signal detection, windowing, or nulling out cannot be characterized as "aborting the signal reception sequence". Because Husted does

not disclose this recited step of aborting, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 19.

Claim 20 recites in part, "**aborting the signal reception sequence** if a decrease in an in-band power measurement of the in-band signal exceeds a delta power decrease limit". The Second Office Action cites paragraphs 0031 and 0054 as teaching these limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses these characterizations based substantially on the same reasons presented for Claim 19. Because Husted does not disclose this recited step of aborting, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20.

Claim 21, as amended, recites in part, "**suppressing a channel busy signal** if the in-band signal is determined to include at least one undesirable characterisitc". The Second Office Action cites paragraphs 0031 and 0054 as teaching these limitations. However, Applicant respectfully submits that weak/strong signal detection, windowing, or nulling out cannot be characterized as "suppressing a channel busy signal". Because Husted does not disclose this recited step of suppressing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 21.

Claim 23 recites in part, "wherein **aborting** is only applied to the inband signal having packets of a designated type". The Second Office Action cites paragraphs 0031 and 0054 as teaching these limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses these characterizations based substantially on the same reasons presented for Claim 19. Because Husted does not disclose this recited aborting, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 23.

Claims 22 And 24 Are Patentable Over Husted And Haverinen

Claims 22 and 24 depend from Claim 21. Therefore, Claims 22 and 24 are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 21. Haverinen fails to remedy the deficiency of Husted with respect to Claim 21. Specifically, Haverinen fails to teach suppressing a channel busy signal. Because neither Husted nor Haverinen disclose or suggest this limitation, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 22 and 24.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-17, 19-24, 51-56, 60, and 62-79 are pending in the present application. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 30547

Jeanette S. Harms
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,537